

Chapter Four

Milton and Millenarianism during the English Revolution

In this chapter, I will delineate the development of Milton's millenarianism in his prose works of 1641-1660. There are three critical moments in the two decades of Milton's prose writing career: on the eve of the English Revolution (1641-42), the defeat of Charles I and the beginning of the Commonwealth (1649-51), and the final years of the Interregnum (1659-60). I will show that Milton did exhibit millenarian ideas in the three historical moments, which corresponded to his contemporary millenarianism. I will argue that the trajectory of Milton's millenarianism in the two decades did not proceed lineally but zigzagly with its ups and downs.

This chapter is divided into two parts, marked by the defeat of Charles I as the watershed. In the first part, I will illustrate that millenarianism permeated the English soil in the 1640s and that Milton's anti-prelatical tracts witnessed its predominance. However, Milton's ardent millenarianism soon quenched after the outbreak of the Civil War. In the second part, I will demonstrate that Milton retrieved his millenarian expectations with the victory of the New Model Army over the royal forces, when English millenarianism soared to an apex. Nevertheless, the resurgence of Milton's millenarianism was only short-lived, and it was not until the eve of the Restoration that Milton reiterated his millenarian anticipations.

I. Milton and Millenarianism in the 1640s

A. Millenarianism on the Eve of the English Revolution

We have seen that the rise of English millenarianism can be attributed to Thomas Brightman and Joseph Mede. Both Brightman's *A Revelation of the Apocalyps* and Mede's *The Key of the Revelation* were not published in England until the end of the

eleven-years' tyranny.¹ "In the 1640s," Stella Revard argues, "millenarianism became an issue that defined and separated Puritans, Presbyterians, and the orthodox oldliners of the Church of England" ("Milton and Millenarianism" 47).² By "Puritans," she means mostly "Independents" (48) and some other more radical groups such as the Fifth Monarchists (49). In short, Revard claims that the "Puritans" were millenarians and that the Presbyterians and Anglicans were anti-millenarians (48-50).³

After the opening of the Long Parliament in 1640, members of Parliament were mainly divided into two groups—Presbyterians and Independents—in terms of committee memberships. Marchamont Nedham, writing in 1647, categorized the participants of the First Civil War (1642-46) into three groups: the King's Party, the Presbyterian Party, and the Independent Party (*The Case of the Kingdom Stated* title page). The English Presbyterians aimed to establish a national church with a presbyterian form of church polity, as the Scottish Church did.⁴ The Independents, on the other hand, desired to free the churches from state control.⁵

Revard's argument deserves more serious scrutiny, however. First of all, the two parties were not mutually exclusive. As J. H. Hexter points out, some of the "Independents" were elders of the parliamentary Presbyterian Church (31), and some of the "Presbyterians" opposed the establishment of a Presbyterian church (39-40). In short, Presbyterians and Independents in the Long Parliament were more political

¹ Mede's *The Key of the Revelation* was published in England in 1643, and Brightman's *A Revelation of the Reuelation*, 1644.

² G. P. Gooch held a similar position: "[a]t the basis of the creed of every religious body of [1640], except the Presbyterians, lay the Millenarian idea" (108).

³ Revards' model was different from the above-mentioned A. S. P. Woodhouse's. Woodhouse uses "Puritans" to refer to "the Presbyterians," "the Independents," and "the Parties of the Left," and he argues that millenarianism only belonged to the third group. Revard does not count "Presbyterians" as "Puritans," which include the Independents and some other more radical groups.

⁴ In 1560 the Scottish Parliament decreed that the protestant Confession of Faith should be the only authorized creed of the Scottish Kingdom, and thus the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland was ratified by law (Froom 2: 448).

⁵ The first English Independent church was founded by Henry Jacob (1563-1624) in 1616. The churches of the independents were known as "separate churches" or "gathered churches" in the sense that they were not "established" (Tolmie 1-4).

parties than religious groups.

Moreover, if millenarianism separated the Independents from the Presbyterians in the 1640s—the former being millenarians, the latter, anit-millenarians—how could Mede’s *Clavis Apocalyptica* be translated into English and published in England by order of the Long Parliament, which was mainly controlled by the Presbyterians?⁶ Furthermore, Revard’s thesis is dubious when we examine Milton’s millenarian positions during the 1640s. Milton first stood for Presbyterianism in his early anti-prelatical pamphlets of 1641-42, in which he demonstrated an enthusiasm for millenarianism. However, he moved toward Independency after the opening of the Westminster Assembly in 1643.⁷ According to Revard’s theory, Milton should have moved from anti-millenarianism to millenarianism in the 1640s. Nevertheless, Milton’s millenarian position moved in the exact opposite direction, as I will demonstrate later.

Revard cites Robert Baillie’s *A Dissvasive from the Errours of the Time* (1645) to support her dichotomy. Baillie (1599-1662), a Scottish Presbyterian who came to England to attend the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643), condemned the millenarianism he witnessed in England during the Revolution. In the opening paragraph of the last chapter of *Dissvasive*, Baillie outlined the history of chiliasm.⁸ Though originating with ante-Nicene theologians such as Cerinthus and Papias, chiliasm was declared heresy since the days of Augustine and died out until the Anabaptists “draw it out of its grave.” Then two German Calvinists—Johannes

⁶ *The Key of the Revelation* was prefaced by William Twisse (c.a. 1577-1646), a Presbyterian and the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly of Divines.

⁷ Milton reproached the Presbyterians in *Areopagitica* (1644): “Bishops and Presbyters are the same to us both name and thing” (25). Also, he upbraided them again in “On the New Forces of Conscience under the Long Paliament” (ca. 1646): “*New Presbyter* is but *Old Priest* writ Large” (*Poems, &c.* 69).

⁸ By “chiliasm” Baillie meant the belief in the realization of an earthly kingdom of God in general. It was not necessarily related to the millennium.

Piscator (1546-1625) and Johann Alsted—continued to advocate the heresy.⁹ It was Joseph Mede that introduced chiliasm to England. In the early 1640s, three Independent divines—John Archer, Thomas Goodwin, and Jeremiah Burroughes (1599-1646)—brought it to a boil: “Mr. Archer, and his Colleague, T. G. at Arnheim, were bold to set up the whole Fabric of *Chiliasme*, which Mr. Burrowes in his *London Lectures upon Hosea* doth press as a necessary and most comfortable ground of Christian Religion, to be infused into the hearts of all children by the care of every parent at the Catechising of their family” (224).¹⁰ Nonetheless, the fact that Archer, Goodwin, and Burroughes were Independents does not guarantee the dichotomy. In a letter to his brother written on September 5 of the same year, Baillie complained about the prevalence of chiliasm in England: “most of the chiefe divines here, not only Independents, bot others, such as Twiss, Marshall, Palmer, and many more, are express Chiliasts” (*The Letters and Journals* 2: 313).¹¹

Millenarianism was by no means limited to the Independents during the English Revolution. John Wilson argues that “the anticipated new ‘age’— explicitly millenarian no not—was that most striking and fundamental characteristic of the formal preaching before the Long Parliament” (*Pulpit in Parliament* 195). Bernard Capp calculates that roughly seventy percent of the Presbyterian and Independent ministers of the Long Parliament “can be identified as millenarians: they believe in an imminent kingdom of glory on earth, either a literal thousand years’ reign, or (often in the case of Presbyterians) a period of ‘latter-day glory,’ and often explained the civil

⁹ For Piscator’s millenarianism, see Hotson, *Paradise Postponed* 121-27.

¹⁰ Archer and Goodwin were colleague ministers at Arhem, the capital city of Gelderland, Netherlands. Archer’s *The Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth* (1642) and Goodwin’s *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* (1641) will be discussed later in this chapter. Burroughes was a minister at Rotterdam, Netherlands. Goodwin and Burroughs were two of the famous “five Dissenting Brethren” at the Westminster Assembly. The other three were Philip Nye (c.a. 1596-1672), Sydrach Simpson (c.a. 1600-55), and William Bridge (c.a. 1660-70).

¹¹ Both Stephen Marshall and Herbert Palmer (1601-1647) were Presbyterian preachers of the Long Parliament.

war as its precursor” (*The Fifth Monarchy Men* 38).¹²

On the other hand, some non-Presbyterian divines still stuck to traditional a-millennialism during the Civil War. For example, John Saltmarsh, one of the leading chaplains in the New Model Army before he died in 1647, opposed the belief in the realization of the millennium on earth: “All the *prophesies*, and *promises* and *glory*, and a *kingdome* of Antichrist to be destroyed...of the *New Jerusalem*...of *Christs* reign or *kingdom*, in any *fleshly* glory, *political* or *monarchical* kingdom, according to any *pattern* upon *earth*...these conceptions or notions are occasioned by the *Allegories*, and *Allusions*, and *Parables* the *Spirit* speaks...they that are weak and carnal...take more in the *Letter* than in the *Spirit*” (23-24).¹³

From Baillie’s list, I choose two Independent divines (Goodwin and Archer) and a Presbyterian chaplain (Marshall) to analyze their millenarian ideas and to illustrate the predominance of millenarianism in the 1640s. I argue that millenarianism in the English Revolution was a commonly shared belief and did not distinguish one denomination from another.

1. Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)

Thomas Goodwin was a preacher at Trinity Church in Cambridge from 1628 to 1634. Refusing to confirm to Archbishop Laud, Goodwin resigned his post in 1634 and went to the Netherlands in 1639 to pastor the independent church at Arnhem. He returned to England in 1641 and became a pastor of a church in London and was appointed a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines in 1643.¹⁴

¹² Capp’s estimate is probably too high. He later modifies his position by admitting that his calculation cannot “record variations in the character of the millenarian beliefs or strength of commitment” (“The Millennium and Eschatology in England” 157). Bryan Ball is more conservative about the proportion, suggesting less than 50% (181), which is still a considerable number.

¹³ Leo Solt states that “[m]ost of the chaplains and Cromwell at first believed that the kingdom of Christ was only a spiritual and not a literal kingdom” (74).

¹⁴ For a detailed biography of Goodwin’s life, see “The Life of Dr. Thomas Goodwin.” For Goodwin’s

Goodwin's chronology of the last things was expressed in *An Exposition of the Book of Revelation* (1639). For Goodwin, the millennium would arrive in about 1700, and his calculations of the events of the last days generally followed Thomas Brightman.¹⁵ As mentioned in the previous chapter, Brightman held that the end of the Roman Antichrist and the fall of the Turks would happen by 1700. Similarly, Goodwin stated that "in the interim of that intermediate space of time between 1650 or '56 and 1700 shall follow the orderly performance of those things which are to end and consummate all before the glorious kingdom of Christ. At first, the ruin of Rome, and so the end of the Antichrist's reign; and then the destruction of the Turkish empire; after which shall begin that great resurrection... falling out about 1700, which is the consummation of all" (198).

Moreover, Goodwin considered the last two chapters of the Apocalypse as an elaboration of the nature of the millennium of the twentieth chapter: "after [John] had compendiously set together in one chapter, chap. xx., the reign of Christ during a thousand years, and the universal judgment that follows, he yet spends the 21st chapter in a more copious and magnificent description of the state of the new Jerusalem, and that kingdom of Christ during those thousand years" (22). In other words, the New Jerusalem is the millennial kingdom, which is not a heavenly monarchy but an earthly realm.

Goodwin further elaborated his idea of the millennium in *The World to Come. Or,*

stay at Arnhem, see Sprunger 227.

¹⁵ Like Brightman, Goodwin used 1260, 1290, and 1335 as key numbers to calculate last things and established a complex chronology. By and large, those last things would befall between 1650 and 1700. However, Goodwin claimed that he found "also Mr Mede, in his *Clavis*, to pitch upon 1656, though tacitly and implicitly, yet clearly enough, as the time he most inclined unto for the expiration of Antichrist's kingdom" (196). What Goodwin found in Mede's *The Key of the Revelation* is the date of the sounding of the first trumpet—395, when Theodosius the First was dead (I. 85). Goodwin took it as the beginning of the Antichrist's reign and dated its end in 1655 (395+1260). Nevertheless, Mede did not identify the sounding of the first trumpet with the beginning of the Antichrist's reign, as we have seen in chapter two.

The Kingdome of Christ Asserted (1655).¹⁶ He first divided the kingdom of Christ into four phases (“degrees”) and placed the millennium in the third. The first phase refers to Jesus’ ministry—“Christ threw down heathenisme, and Jewisme” (28). Goodwin and his contemporaries were “under the second days work” (28), expecting the destruction of the Popery and Turks. The conversion of the Jews and Gentiles would bring in the third phase, and “part of Heaven shall come down...and that it may clearly put down old *Adams* world” (30)—the advent of the millennium. Like Joseph Mede, Goodwin literally interpreted the first resurrection of the saints as the corporeal resurrection of the martyrs under the Roman persecution (31-32). In addition, he insisted that the saints reign on earth not in heaven (32-33). The resurrected saints would substitute for angels: “That which good Angels do to the Saints in this present state below, that office and worke shall the Saints that arise from the dead perform unto the Saints that shall remaine alive in that world to come” (15). However, Goodwin argued that Christ would not “come down from Heaven to reign on earth” but would “remaine in Heaven” (30). In other words, Christ would not arrive until the fourth phase—the Judgment Day: “after the generall resurrection both of just and unjust...Jesus Christ himself will come down and abide a long day here below” (37).

We can conclude that Goodwin’s millenarian position is a combination of pre- and post-millennialism. On the one hand, he, like other pre-millennialists, expected the bodily resurrection of the martyrs and an earthly millennial kingdom fundamentally different from this world. On the other hand, he, like other post-millennialists, believed that Christ would not come until the end of the millennium.

A Glimpse of Sions Glory (1641)

¹⁶ Though published in 1655, the two sermons of Goodwin’s collected in *The World to Come* were preached probably about 1640 (Haller, *The Rise of Puritanism* 397; Wilson, “A Glimpse of Syons Glory” 69-70).

Scholars have regarded *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* as one of the most important texts of the mid-seventeenth-century English millenarianism. A. S. P. Woodhouse in *Puritanism and Liberty* treats it as an exemplary illustration of the idea of “the Millennium at hand” (233); William Haller cites it in *Rise of Puritanism* as “a moving expression of the species of religious Utopianism” (271); Tai Liu devotes the first chapter of *Discord in Zion* to a thorough analysis of the text.

Recent critics tend to believe that the fast sermon was preached by Thomas Goodwin, but its authorship had been a critical issue.¹⁷ The title page of its 1641 edition held by the British Library does not bear the author’s name. However, a slightly different title page appears in the twelfth volume of *The Works of Thomas Goodwin* in Nichol’s Series of Standard Divines (1866)—two lines are added: “Briefly layd open in a Sermon, at a general Fastday in *Holland*./ By T. G.”¹⁸ Robert Baillie in *Dissvative* ascribed it to Thomas Goodwin: “The glimpse of *Sions* glory Preached at a Fast in *Holland* by T. G. (which common report without any contradiction that I have heard declares to be *Thomas Goodwin*)” (79-80). It is now generally agreed among scholars that Goodwin was the preacher.

The preacher proclaimed that the millennium was at hand: “We heare of the voice of the Multitude in our owne Countrey, as the voice of many Waters, they cry up the Kingdome of *Christ*, and cry downe the Kingdome of *Antichrist*, cry downe *Babylon*, and the *Prelacie* ” (7). He referred to Revelation 19.1-6, in which the multitude in heaven hails Hallelujah in praise of the fall of the Whore of Babylon.

¹⁷ A. S. P. Woodhouse and William Haller attributed it to Hanserd Knollys (c.a. 1599-1691). A survey of the debates was reviewed by John Wilson in “A Glimpse of Syons Glory” (1962). Most of later scholars follow Wilson in accepting Goodwin to be the author beyond reasonable doubt (Dallison 131-36).

¹⁸ The title page notes that “This Sermon is reprinted from a copy kindly placed at our disposal by Mr Grosart, the only copy known to be extant. We are not aware who the author of the Epistle to the Reader may have been, but there can be no doubt that the Sermon is an authentic production of Dr Goodwin” (62). The original copy is at the Emmanuel College Library, Cambridge (Wilson, “A Glimpse of Syons Glory” 69).

After the fall of Babylon comes the New Jerusalem (2). The New Jerusalem in Revelation 21-22 is an earthly kingdom, a “glorious estate of the church” (19). “*God Omnipotent reigneth*” the glorious church, in which “the Saints shall sing this glorious *Hallelujah*” (20). Christ will reign the church, His Kingdom, for a thousand years (14), which is a “Truth received in the *Primitive Times*” by Ante-Nicene Fathers such as Justine Martyr and Lactantius (15). Therefore, it is clear that the preacher identified the New Jerusalem with the millennial kingdom, as Goodwin did. The millennial kingdom is “a Time before...the Day of Judgment” (15). As to the timing of the inauguration of the millennium, the preacher admitted that he, like Goodwin, drew on Thomas Brightman in asserting that it should take place during 1650 and 1695 (32).

However, two exegetical touchstones have been neglected by the scholars that join the authorship debates: the manner of Christ’s reign and the identity of the saints.¹⁹ In *The World to Come*, Goodwin argued that Christ would remain in heaven and reign the millennial kingdom through the saints, as indicated above. In *A Glimpse of Sions Glory*, however, the preacher insisted that Christ come to reign “*personally*” on earth during the millennium (13). But the preacher later softened his argument: “we will not fully determine of the manner of his Personall Reigning, but thus farre wee may see there is a Voice of great waters, though not distinct: but a *Probability* in his Person God and Man; he shall reigne vpon the Earth, here in this World before that great and Solemne Day” (13). Accordingly, we may claim that the preacher of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* was a modified pre-millennialist in terms of the manner of Christ’s reign: he tended to anticipate Christ’s personal reign on earth but not beyond doubt.

The second issue is the identity of the saints, which leads to the question of the

¹⁹ As far as I know, only Peter Toon and R. B. Carter mention the question of Christ’s reign (Toon, “The Authorship of the ‘Glimpse of Syons Glory’” 134-35), but the question of the identity of the saints has not been discussed by scholars.

interpretation of the first resurrection. We have seen that Goodwin in *The World to Come* identified the saints with both the bodily resurrected martyrs and the living church members of his day. However, the preacher of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* identified the saints with the “gathering church” (the Independents): “the Inhabitants of *Ierusalem*, that is, the Saints of *God* gathered together in a Church, are the best Common-wealths men” (26). At the end of the sermon, the preacher advocated that “the Communion of *Saints*, and independency of Congregations *God* will honour” (33). Since the primitive martyrs are not included, the first resurrection is interpreted allegorically as the conversion of the Jews: “It is the resurrection from the Dead, as the *Apostle* speaks, *Rom.* 11. concerning the Calling of the Iewes” (20). Therefore, the preacher of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* held one of the tenets of post-millennialism: spiritual interpretation of the first resurrection.

To sum up, the millenarian position of the preacher of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* is a combination of pre- and post-millennialism. On the one hand, like other pre-millennialists, he believed in Christ’s Second Coming to inaugurate an earthly millennial kingdom (the New Jerusalem). On the other hand, the preacher, like other post-millennialists, interpreted the first resurrection as the conversion of the Jews. If the preacher was indeed Thomas Goodwin, as most recent scholars agree, then we have to accept that he was ambivalent about the manner of Christ’s reign of the millennial kingdom and the interpretation of the first resurrection.

2. John Archer (?-1642)

John Archer was a colleague of Thomas Goodwin’s at Arnhem. A lecturer in London in 1629, Archer was silenced by Laud and fled to Arnhem in 1637 (Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men* 31; Sprunger 227). He served the Arnhem church from 1637 until his death. His *Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth* was published in London

in 1642 and was widely circulated among the Parliamentary camp.²⁰

Archer divided world history into three phases, corresponding to three stages of Christ's rule: providential, spiritual, and monarchical (1-2). The title *The Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth* referred to the third phase: Christ's monarchical kingdom. Archer argued that "Christ has three commings: The first was when he came to take our nature, and make satisfaction for sinne. The second is, when he comes to receive his Kingdome...which is that now I am speaking of. A third is, that when he comes to judge all, and end the world: the latter commings are two distinct commings" (16). The monarchical kingdom was the millennial kingdom (40), which was also identified with the fifth monarchy of Daniel 2 (9) as well as the New Jerusalem of Revelation 21 (10).

Archer established a specific chronology for the last things. He dated the conversion of the Jews to 1650 or 1656 (52),²¹ the end of the Antichrist's reign to 1666,²² and the parousia to 1700: "it is likely, that Christs comming from heaven, and raising the dead and beginning his Kingdom, and the thousand yeeres will be about the yeere of our Lord 1700" (53).²³

Archer literally interpreted the first resurrection of the saints: "First, hee will raise up the *Saints*, which are dead before this his comming, not onely such as have been Martyred, as some thinke, but all *Saints* who have dyed in the *Faith*, Rev. 20.4. not onely they that were *beheaded*, but all that subjected not to Antichrist, by which innocency from Popery, hee means all *Saints*" (17). After destroying the armies of the

²⁰ Some copies of *The Personall Reigne of Christ upon Earth* bear the author's name as "Henry" Archer—a mistaken attribution. For details, see Ball 127.

²¹ The Jews will be called 1290 years after the "abomination that maketh desolate" was set up (Daniel 12.11). Following Brightman, Archer identified the "abomination" with "the Raigne of the Imperour *Iulian* the Apostate, who raigned in the yeare of our Lord 360. or 366. and set up Heathenism" (51). $1290 + (360 \text{ or } 366) = 1650 \text{ or } 1656$. In fact, Julian the Apostate came to throne in 360, not 366.

²² Archer dated the beginning of the Antichrist's reign to 406, when "the *Bishop of Rome* began to usurpe Papall power (47). $1260 + 406 = 1666$.

²³ Everything will come to a consummation 1335 years after the abomination (Daniel 12.12). $1335 + (360 \text{ or } 366) = 1700$.

wicked (22), Christ would “withdraw to heaven againe, and leave the Government to the dead Saints raised up” (23). In other words, the millennial kingdom is ruled by Christ through the resurrected saints “in his name and by his appointment, and in a speciall presence of his, though not bodily” (23). After the millennium, Satan would be loosened to draw Gog and Magog to “assault the Saints...for a little season...*but Christ will suddenly come from Heaven, and with fire kill all these wicked ones*” (34). Christ’s third coming would initiate the Judgment Day (34).

Archer was a typical pre-millennialist. Like Joseph Mede, Archer argued that Christ’s Second Coming would initiate the millennium and literally resurrect the dead martyrs. But unlike Mede, who claimed that the Last Judgment would coincide with the millennium, Archer stated that Christ would return to heaven after binding Satan, leaving the saints to govern the millennial kingdom.

3. Stephen Marshall (c.a. 1594-1655)

Millenarianism spread among not only the Independents but also the Presbyterians. One of the most famous Presbyterian millenarian was Stephen Marshall. In 1636, Marshall, then Vicar of Finchingfield, Essex, was reported to the ecclesiastical authorities for “irregularities and want of conformity,” and was described by Sir Nathaniel Brentas to Archbishop Laud as “a dangerous person.” He was one of the five divines known as “Smectymnuus,”²⁴ who in 1641 and 1642 argued against Bishop Joseph Hall’s defense of the episcopal hierarchy and upheld a presbyterian form of church government. Three of Milton’s five anti-prelatical pamphlets were also engaged in the pamphlet warfare between Smectymnuus and

²⁴ SM stands for Stephen Marshall; EC, Edmund Calamy; TY, Thomas Young; MN, Matthew Newcomen; UUS, William Spurstow. Of the five, Thomas Young, a Scotsman from Perthshire, was Milton’s domestic tutor from 1618 to 1620.

Hall.²⁵

Marshall was the most popular preacher of the Long Parliament. According to Thomas Fuller's (1608-1661) *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), Marshall "was their *Trumpet*, by whom they *sounded* their solemn *Fasts*, preaching more *publick Sermons* on that occasion, then any *four* of his Function. In their *Sickness* he was their *Confessor* in their *Assembly* their *Councillour*, in their *Treaties* their *Chaplain*, in their *Disputations* their *Champion*" ("Huntington-shire" 53). During 1640 and 1649, Marshall preached many times before the House of Lords and the House of Commons on the regular monthly fast days, including the initial fast in November 1640 and the last fast on the day after Charles I's death in January 1649. Even after the Pride's purge, when most of the Presbyterians were removed from Parliament, Marshall remained popular to the Independents and preached twice to the Rump Parliament (Wilson, *Pulpit in Parliament* 109-10).

Marshall expressed millenarian ideas in his sermons. In *A Peace-Making*, a sermon preached to the House of Commons at a public thanksgiving on September 7, 1641, Marshall encouraged members of Parliament: "you have *great works* to do, the planting of a new heaven and a new earth amongst us" (22). In *Reformation and Desolation* (1641), a fast sermon preached to the House of Commons, Marshall stated that "many ten thousand Saints in *England*, who not onely abstaine from the abominations of the times, but mourne for them, and give God no rest night nor day, untill he bow the heavens, and come downe, and set up for himselfe a glorious Throne amongst us" (44). In *The Song of Moses the Servant of God, and the Song of the Lambe* (1643), another sermon preached to the House of Commons, Marshall commented on Revelation 15.2-4. "This text," Marshall said, "though it be a part of

²⁵ They are *Of Prelatical Episcopacy* (1641), *Animadversions* (1641), and *Apology for Smectymnuus* (1642).

the *Apocalyps*, the *darkest*, and *most mysticall* Book in all the Scriptures, and therefore thought generally hard to be understood, yet time (one of the best Interpreters of Prophecies) hath produced the *events* answering the *types* so full and clear, that we have the whole Army of Protestant Interpreters agreeing in the generall scope and meaning of it” (3). He went on to state that “[a]ll Protestant Writers do agree, that we are under the pouring out of some *one* or more of these seven vialls” (44). Marshall taught that members of Parliament were “*one of the Angels*, who are to poure out the viall of the wrath of God” (37), no matter which vial it was.²⁶ He claimed that “[a]s the *seven Trumpets* were so many degrees of destruction of the Heathen *Empire*, so the *seven vialls* are so many degrees of the destruction and ruin of the *Antichristian Empire*” (45). In other words, the 1260 years of the Antichrist’s reign was drawing to an end: “[I]n the end, all the Kingdoms of the World shall be the Kingdoms of our Lord, and his Saints, and they shall reign over them” (47).

We can see that Stephen Marshall was a different kind of millenarian from Thomas Goodwin and John Archer. Marshall did not set up a specific chronology of the last events, nor did he articulate the manner of the millennial kingdom, apparently unconcerned about whether the first resurrection of the saints would be spiritual or corporeal, whether Christ’s reign would be in heaven or on earth, or whether Christ’s Coming would initiate or terminate the millennium. Marshall’s main concern was to urge members of Parliament together with the saints to defeat Antichrist—be it Laudian episcopatism or Caroline royalism.

B. Milton’s Early Millenarian Ideas

1. *Of Reformation* (1641) and *Animadversions* (1641)

²⁶ Both Brightman and Mede argued that England was under the pouring of the fourth vial at their time (Brightman, *A Revelation of the Apocalyps* 541-44; Mede, *The Key of the Revelation* II.116).

With the opening of the Long Parliament as well as the impeachment and imprisonment of Archbishop Laud, the call for a presbyterian form of the church polity was gaining power. The high-church party, represented by Joseph Hall, was losing the battle against the root-and-branch party, represented by Smectymnuus.²⁷ Milton took the root-and-branch position, and his earliest five tracts were devoted to calling for the extirpation of prelacy.

At the beginning of the second book of *The Reason of Church-Government* (1642), Milton explained why he committed himself to prose writing.²⁸ It was “the enforcement of conscience” that drove him to “this wayward subject against prelacy, the touching whereof is so distastfull and disquietous to a number of men” (36). He considered “this manner of writing” as a task of his “left hand” (37). Although he was determined to be a “Poet soaring in the high region of his fancies with his garland and singing robes about him” (37), his conscience asked him to “leave a calme and pleasing solitarynes fed with cherful and confident thoughts, to imbarke in a troubl’d sea of noises and hoars disputes” (41).

Almost all of the scholars agree that Milton was a millenarian during 1641-1642.²⁹ Of the five anti-prelatical tracts, *Of Reformation* (May, 1641) and *Animadversions* (July, 1641) have been used to illustrate Milton’s millenarianism. The

²⁷ The manifesto of the high-church party was Hall’s *An Humble Remonstrance* (1640), in which the author contended for episcopacy by divine right. Smectymnuus’s *An Answer to a Book Entitvled, An Humble Remonstrance* (1641), on the contrary, called for the extirpation of episcopacy. The “Root and Branch Petition to Parliament,” signed by 15,000 citizens of London, was presented on December 11, 1640. The “Root and Branch Bill” was introduced to Parliament on May 27, 1641. The Act for the Abolition of Episcopacy was passed on February 20, 1643. Episcopacy was finally abolished by a parliamentary ordinance on October 9, 1646. For details, see James Spalding and Maynard Brass’s “Reduction of Episcopacy as a Means to Unity in England, 1640-1662.”

²⁸ For information about editions and dates of composition of Milton’s prose works, see John Shawcross’s “A Survey of Milton’s Prose Works.”

²⁹ The only exception is Janel Mueller. She argues that “there is no room for millenarianism in *Of Reformation*” (19). Crawford Gribben is ambiguous about Milton’s millenarian position in *Of Reformation* (1641). On the one hand, quoting “the Eternall and shortly-expected King shalt open the Clouds to judge the severall Kindomes of the World,” he argues that Milton was an a-millennialist who considered “the millennium to have been fulfilled in the past” (129). On the other hand, he cites the same passage to demonstrate Milton’s “overtly millenarian hopes of the summer of 1641” (136).

peroration of *Of Reformation* has received the most critical attention. Having argued for the dismantling of the episcopal system of bishops and ecclesiastical hierarchy, Milton prayed to the “Eternall and Propitious *Throne*” (86) to have mercy on “the afflicted state of this our shaken *Monarchy*” (87). At the end of the apotheosis, Milton offered his sincere panegyric to Christ: “Then amidst the *Hymns* and *Halleluiahs* of *Saints* some one may perhaps bee heard offering at high *strains* in new and lofty *Measures* to sing and celebrate thy *divine Mercies*, and *marvelous Judgements*” (89). The passage echoed Revelation 19.6, the key verse of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory*. As discussed above, the preacher of *A Glimpse of Sions Glory* proclaimed that the saints’ hail heralded the New Jerusalem (the millennium). Likewise, Milton anticipated that “the Eternall and shortly-expected King shall open the Clouds to judge the severall Kingdomes of the World, and distributing *Nationall Honours* and *Rewards* to Religious and just *Common-wealths*, shalt put an end to all Earthly *Tyrannies*, proclaiming thy universal and milde *Monarchy* through Heaven and Earth” (89). Most of the critics agree that the sentence is definitely millenarian. However, Janel Mueller contends that the state is “in a heaven beyond time” (19). Here we encounter the same old question—Is the kingdom terrestrial or celestial?

Two things should be noted. First, the “Eternall and shortly-expected King” would come to earth to launch the Judgment Day. Second, the “universal and milde *Monarchy*” would be proclaimed through Heaven and Earth. If the “*Monarchy*” does refer to the millennial kingdom, we can conclude that Milton shared Mede’s opinion of synchronizing the millennium with the Judgment Day. Unfortunately, Milton did not elaborate on the manner of the monarchy of the “Eternall and shortly-expected King.”

Another relevant exegetical touchstone is the issue of Antichrist. Milton argued that the Roman Antichrist was “bred up by Constantine” (30), and “Antichrist began

first to put forth his horn” after the end of the dynasty of “his race” (29).³⁰ In other words, the Antichrist’s reign began around 360. Antichrist would rule until the Reformation that “strook through the black and settled Night of *Ignorance* and *Antichristian Tyranny*” (6). Regarding John Wycliffe (c.a. 1330-1384) as the harbinger of England’s religious reformation, Milton claimed that England “had this *grace* and *honour* from GOD to bee the first that should set up a Standard for the recovery of *lost Truth*, and blow the first *Evangelick Trumpet* to the *Nations*, holding up, as from a Hill, the new Lampe of *saving light* to all Christendome” (7). Obviously, Milton stood in the tradition of the elect nation, regarding England as God’s instrument to defeat Antichrist.

England was freed by God “from *Antichristian* thraldome” (87) since Elizabeth’s ascension to the throne, but prelacy was damaging the English reformation. As the Roman Catholic Church was corrupted by “*Constantines* wealth” (29), so the Church of England was being corrupted by the extravagance of the prelates: “the Idolatrous erection of Temples beautified exquisitely to out-vie the Papists, the costly and deare-bought Scandals, and snares of Images, Pictures, rich Coaps, gorgeous Altar-clothes” (61-62). Milton claimed that “*Antichrist* is *Mammons* Son” (62) and that “Wealth...is the Serpents Egge that will hatch an *Antichrist* wheresoever, and ingender the same Monster as big” (62). If the prelacy were not immediately abolished, “wee shall see *Antichrist* shortly wallow here, though his cheife Kennell be at *Rome*” (62). Therefore, Milton implored God to deliver England from the corruption of prelacy “that for these Fourescore Yeares hath been breeding to eat through the entrals of our *Peace*” (88). To conclude, Milton envisaged history as an incessant battle between Christ and Antichrist, in which England played the role as

³⁰ The three emperors of Constantine’s family were Constantine himself, Constntius (his son), and Julian (his nephew).

Christ's soldiers. He believed that "the Eternall and shortly-expected King" would soon prevail but equivocated about the status after the defeat of Antichrist. However, whether the "universal and milde *Monarchy*" is an earthly kingdom or a heavenly one remains unclear. The question, nevertheless, can be resolved when we compare the apotheosis of *Of Reformation* with the concluding paragraph of the fourth section of *Animadversions*.

Animadversions upon the Remonstrants Defence against Smectymnuus is a point-by-point reply to Joseph Hall's *Defence of the Humble Remonstrance against the Frivolous and False Exceptions of Smectymnuus* (1642). In the concluding argument of section four, Milton stated that God "hath yet ever had this iland under the speciall indulgent eye of his providence" (36). England began reformation "fourscore yeares" ago (35) and came to a critical point: God had "sent out the spirit of prayer upon [His] servants over all the Land to this effect, and stirr'd up their vows as the sound of many waters about [His] Throne" (37-38). The paragraph resembles in nearly every respect the panegyric in *Of Reformation*.

It is in this paragraph that Milton for the first time uttered his belief in the realization of an earthly godly kingdom: "the new Ierusalem, which...descends from Heaven" (35). Believing the New Jerusalem would be soon actualized in England, Milton offered a hymn to God, articulating an unequivocal belief in the imminence of a terrestrial millennial kingdom established by Christ's divine intervention: "thy Kingdome is now at hand, and thou standing at the dore. Come forth out of thy Royall Chambers, O Prince of all the Kings of the earth, put on the visible roabes of thy imperiall Majesty, take up that unlimited Scepter which thy Almighty Father hath bequeath'd thee; for now the voice of thy Bride calls thee; and all creatures sigh to bee renew'd" (38-39).

Based on the argument above, I postulate that the final peroration of *Of*

Reformation should be read together with the hymn at the end of the fourth section of *Animadversions* and that both passages expressed Milton's pre-millennialism. Thus, the "universal and milde *Monarchy*" in *Of Reformation* was "the new Ierusalem, which...descends from Heaven" in *Animadversions*; "the Eternall and shortly-expected King" was about to initiate an earthly millennial kingdom as well as the Last Judgment, for Christ would "open the Clouds to judge the severall Kingdomes of the World." Consequently, I contend that Milton's pre-millennialism was like Joseph Mede's: both synchronized the Judgment Day with the millennium. Nevertheless, Milton's millenarian stance was closer to Stephen Marshall's. Both did not set up a chronology of the last events, nor did they elaborate on the nature of the first resurrection or the manner of Christ's reign. Like Marshall, Milton was more concerned with the cosmic battle against Antichrist. Considering England as the elect nation, Milton urged his fellow countrymen to extirpate prelacy, the offspring of papal Antichrist.

2. *Areopagitica* (1644)

Milton's hope for the millennium, however, did not grow with the gaining ground of the Parliamentarians as the Civil War proceeded. Six pamphlets were published during 1643 and 1645—*Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce* (1643/1644), *Of Education* (June, 1644), *The Judgement of Martin Bucer Concerning Divorce* (August, 1644), *Areopagitica* (November, 1644), *Tetrachordon* (March, 1645), and *Colasterion* (March, 1645). Most of the critics do not find any trace of millenarianism in them, except in *Areopagitica*, which has drawn several scholars' attention.

On June 14, 1643, the House of Commons passed the licensing order, against which Milton wrote *Areopagitica*. The order was designed for "suppressing the great late abuses and frequent disorders in Printing many, false forged, scandalous,

sedition, libellous, and unlicensed Papers, Pamphlets, and Books to the great defamation of Religion and government” (3). It demanded that “no Order or Declaration of both, or either House of *Parliament* shall be printed by any, but by order of one or both the said Houses: Nor other Book, Pamphlet, paper, nor part of any such Book, Pamphlet, or paper, shall from henceforth be printed, bound, stitched or put to sale by any person or persons whatsoever, unless the same be first approved of and licensed under the hands of such person or persons as both, or either of the said Houses shall appoint for the licensing of the same” (4-5).

Milton’s *Areopagitica* aimed to plea for the liberty of unlicensed publication. Milton argued that good and evil inseparably grew together in the post-lapsarian world. Man should be granted the opportunity to exercise his conscience to choose good from evil. Apparently, Milton drew on Christ’s parable of the wheat and the tares (Matthew 13.24-30, 36-43). The good (the wheat) and the evil (the tares) should be left mixed until they are separated at the harvest time (Christ’s Second Coming).

The critics’ discussions on Milton’s millenarian ideas in *Areopagitica* are centered around two issues: whether Milton still anticipated Christ’s immediate coming and whether Milton still maintained his millenarianism. Arthur Barker and Barbara Lewalski argue that Milton did not expect an imminent parousia in *Areopagitica* (Barker 195-96; Lewalski, “Milton and the Millennium” 18). Their argument is based on the following passage:

Truth indeed came once into the world with her divine Master, and was a perfect shape most glorious to look on: but when he ascended...then strait arose a wicked race of deceivers, who...took the virgin Truth, hewd her lovely form into a thousand peeces, and scatter’d them to the four winds. From that time ever since, the sad friends of Truth...went up and down gathering up limb by limb, still as they could find them. We have not yet

found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall do, till her Masters
second coming; he shall bring together every joynt and member, and shall
mould them into an immortall feature of lovelines and perfection. (29)

The primary duty of a Christian in this fallen world is to seek Truth, which, like a broken pottery, has been torn into a thousand pieces and scattered to the four winds. The pursuit for Truth cannot be perfected until the parousia—the idea we have seen in the Nativity Ode. However, Milton cared not so much about the perfection of the pursuit as about our task in the imperfect world: “To sequester out of the world into Atlantic and Utopian polities which never can be drawn into use, will not mend our condition; but to ordain wisely as in this world of evil, in the midst whereof God hath placed us unavoidably” (17). Obviously, Milton showed no fervency for the anticipation of Christ’s Second Coming as he did in *Of Reformation* and *Animadversions*.

As for Milton’s millenarian position in *Areopagitica*, most of the critics agree that Milton still held millenarianism. Arthur Barker and David Loewenstein state that the above passage reveals Milton’s millenarian ideas (Barker 195; Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History* 39). However, their statement is questionable, for the passage alludes not so much to Revelation 20 as to 1 Corinthians 13.12, where Paul claims that our knowledge cannot be perfect until the Second Coming of Christ. To promote the lifelong pursuit for the Truth, Milton repeatedly stressed the importance of “now”: “now, as our obdurate Clergy have with violence demean’d the matter, we are become hitherto the latest and the backwardest Schollers...Now once again by all concurrence of signs...God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in his Church... Behold now this vast City...” (31). Since Milton advocated the importance of the search for the Truth in the fallen world, the “new and great period in his Church” cannot mean the millennium, as Stella Revard suggests

(“Milton and Millenarianism” 42). For the same reason, Milton’s urge for the “new enlightened steps in the discovery of truth” (38) cannot be regarded as “millennial expectations,” as Hugh Trevor-Roper proposes (258). Simply put, Milton did not mention anything about the millennium in *Areopagitica*.

Therefore, we can conclude that Milton did not express any urgency of millenarianism in any of his prose works of 1643-45. The subsidence of Milton’s millenarianism in that period further corroborates that millenarianism did not serve as a marker that separated the Independents from the Presbyterians, since Milton gradually turned from Presbyterianism to Independency after the opening of the Westminster Assembly. Of all the critics, only Gribben rightly argues that *Areopagitica* represents Milton’s “passage from the heady apocalypticism of 1641-2 to his repudiation of such ideology after 1645” (148). However, Milton’s millenarianism did not utterly disappear. It resuscitated after the total defeat of the king, as we will see later.

II. Milton and Millenarianism in the 1650s

A. The Fifth Monarchy and the End of the Civil War

The most notorious English millenarianism in the 1650s was the Fifth Monarchist Movement. In this section, I will analyze the idea of the identification of the fifth monarchy of Daniel with the millennium of Revelation and portray its development in England until the end of the Civil War.

The fifth monarchy of Daniel had not been identified with the millennial kingdom of Revelation until the seventeenth century. We have seen that Daniel’s first four monarchies have been traditionally interpreted by the Protestants as Babylonia, Persia, Greece, and Rome. The sixteenth-century Magisterial Reformers, such as Luther and Calvin, did not anticipate an earthly fifth monarchy, nor did they identify

the fifth monarchy with the millennium.³¹ On the other hand, some of the German radical Anabaptists, such as Thomas Müntzer, preached the forthcoming of a fifth monarchy on earth. But we should notice that they did not equate the eternal earthly empire with the millennium.³² The Catholics, devout upholders of a-millennialism as they were, repudiated the idea of a blissful terrestrial fifth monarchy. But the idea of the fifth monarchy was associated with the concept of the universal monarchy that grew with the sixteenth-century Spanish imperialism.

After Charles I of Spain (1500-58) became the Holy Roman Emperor (Charles V) in 1519, Spain acted as the surrogate of the Roman Catholic Church. With the support of the Church of Rome, the king of Spain expanded his territories, and England, among other European countries, was seriously threatened by Spanish imperialism. Philip II's (1527-98) marriage with Mary Tudor in 1554 further exasperated the English antagonism against Spain. The anti-Spanish sentiment was greatly promoted during Elizabeth's reign, and the idea of a religious crusade against Spain grew therewith.³³ For the Spanish, the Roman Empire was the fourth monarchy, and the fifth should be a universal monarchy restlessly sought.³⁴

Therefore, "the fifth monarchy" was "*a mark of Ignominy and Reproach*" in England before the Civil War (Goodwin, *Sermon of Fifth Monarchy* A2). Milton mentioned the term twice in his prose works of the early 1640s. In *Of Reformation* (1641), Milton accused the prelates of being the "Twin-brother" of the "Jesuites":

³¹ As mentioned in chapter one, Luther argued that the millennium was in the past and that the fifth monarchy (a heavenly kingdom) was in the future.

³² As shown in chapter one, Müntzer, sub-dividing the fourth monarchy into two, was expecting a "sixth" monarchy, but he never explicitly identified it with the millennium. Melchior Hoffman, as we have seen, believed in a past millennium and a future earthly fifth monarchy.

³³ For the development of English anti-Spanish sentiment, see William Maltby's *The Black Legend in England*.

³⁴ For the primary texts of English hatred of the Spanish universal monarchy, see Paul Grebner, *A Brief Description of the Future History of Europe* (1650) 33; Fulke Greville, *The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney* (1652) 29-30; Cornelius Vermuyden's paper relating a treaty between England and the United Provinces in 1653 (Thurloe II:126); and *The King of Spains Cabinet Council Divulged* (1658) 88. For the idea of the universal monarchy in Spanish imperialism, see Anthony Pagden's *Spanish Imperialism and the Political Imagination*, especially chapter 2.

“they feeling the Axe of Gods reformation, hewing at the old and hollow trunk of Papacie, and finding the Spaniard their surest friend, and safest refuge, to sooth him up in his dreame of a fift Monarchy” (53). In *Tetrachordon* (1645), another divorce tract, Milton prefixed an address to Parliament, vindicating himself from the attacks of his adversaries: “Ignorance, and illiterate presumption, which is yet but our disease, will turn at length into our very constitution, and prove the hectic evil of this age: worse to be fear’d, if it get once to reign over us, then any fift Monarchy.” Far from being a dreamland, the “fift Monarchy” was Milton’s nightmare in the 1640s.

The identification of the fifth monarchy with the millennial kingdom was first proposed in England at the turn of the seventeenth century. Thomas Brightman regarded the fifth monarchy as the last part of the second millennium (starting around 1650 to 1700), and Joseph Mede further equated both kingdoms.³⁵ Consequently, the identification was widely held by the followers of Brightman and Mede during the Civil War.

The dream of the fifth monarchy seemed to be materialized when Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) defeated the Scots in the battle of Preston in August 1648 and ended the Second Civil War. According to Brightman’s chronology, 1650 signified the onset of a new era. Thus, many people began to be prepared for the arrival of the fifth monarchy. The New Model Army, controlled by the Independents, determined to execute Charles and to establish a commonwealth. However, the Parliament, dominated by the Presbyterians, intended to negotiate with Charles and to reinstate him on some mutual beneficial terms. To ensure the enforcement of the army’s determination, Colonel Thomas Pride forcibly removed all of the members of Parliament that tried to reach some agreement with the king. As a result, the Parliament was purged in December 1648, and soon the Rump Parliament tried the

³⁵ See chapter two.

king for treason and found him guilty. On January 30, 1649, Charles I was beheaded, and England became a republic known as the Commonwealth.

Many later Fifth Monarchists—such as John Tillinghast (1604-55), William Aspinwall (1605-1662), Christopher Feake (1611-1682), Mary Cary (1621-1653), and John Rogers (1627-c.a. 1665)—rejoiced at the execution of the king and were ready to welcome the coming of the fifth monarchy.³⁶ For example, William Aspinwall claimed that before the end of the Antichrist's reign in 1673, "it will be necessary that the ten hornes, or Kings, which are the strength of the Beast, be broken off, which work is already begun in the Beheading of *Charles*...according to that in *Dan. 7. 11.24.26*.... Now this Kingdome of Christ which I call the fifth Monarchy, shall begin..." (14). Mary Cary, a Fifth Monarchist prophetess, also identified Charles I with the little horn in the seventh chapter of Daniel (6) and with the Beast in Revelation (118). John Rogers interpreted the execution of the king as the destruction of the fourth kingdom in the second chapter of Daniel (*Ohel or Beth-Shemesh 25*).

The expectations of the fifth monarchy reached a climax during the Third Civil War (1649-1651). The Declaration of Musselburgh, announced by the English army on August 1, 1650, best witnessed the fervor of the millennial expectations. They declared that Charles I "was one of the ten horns of the Beast spoken of, *Revel. 17. 12, 13, 14, 15*" (12) and asked the Scots to "joyn together in the advancement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ" and to "rejoyce to see the Horns of the Beast cut off" (15). The soldiers, according to Christopher Feake, were "as if *they were Fifth-Kingdom-men at the highest rate*" (30).

B. Milton's Regicide Tracts and the First *Defence* (1649-51)

³⁶ For more discussions of the Fifth Monarchists' interpretation of the regicide, see Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men* 51-52 and Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England* 106-16.

After the publications of *Tetrachordon* and *Colasterion* in March, 1645, Milton did not publish any writings except the collection of his early poems. The execution of Charles I in 1649, nevertheless, brought Milton back to the public. He was appointed secretary for the Foreign Tongues of the Council of State on March 15, 1649 (Masson 4: 79). Before his total blindness in 1652, Milton published three prose works—*The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (February, 1649), *Eikonoklastes* (October, 1649), *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* (February, 1651)³⁷—all of which are discussed by the scholars to explore Milton’s millenarianism around 1650.³⁸

The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates first appeared within a fortnight after Charles’s execution. The target, of course, was the Presbyterians who supported the idea of the divine kingship. Milton’s main argument was that the power of kings or magistrates were not given by God but entrusted by people, for God should be the only king. In the enlarged second edition, which appeared in late 1649 or early 1650,³⁹ Milton praised the supreme kingship of God at the end of the pamphlet: “Therefore he who is our only King, the root of *David*, and whose Kingdom is eternal righteousness, with all those that Warr under him, whose happiness and final hopes are laid up in that only just & rightful kingdom (which we pray incessantly may com soon, and in so praying with hasty ruin and destruction to all Tyrants) eev’n he our immortal King, and all that love him, must of necessity have in abomination these blind and lame Defenders of *Jerusalem*; as the soule of *David* hated them, and forbid them entrance into Gods House, and his own” (58-59). Scholars have regarded “the

³⁷ *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* is also called the *First Defence* because Milton published *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Secunda* (the *Second Defence*) in 1654.

³⁸ In addition to the three works, Milton also wrote “Observations on the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels” (May, 1649), published as an appendix to James Ormond’s *Articles of Peace*.

³⁹ Some of the existent copies dated 1649 and some 1650. For more information on the dates of the second edition, see John Shawcross’s “Milton’s *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*.” Shawcross is convinced that “the second edition may actually have appeared first in 1649” (7).

only just & rightful kingdom” as the millennial kingdom.⁴⁰ Unfortunately, the passage did not provide an answer to the question whether the monarchy was an earthly millennial kingdom or the kingdom of heaven. Nevertheless, I argue that it did refer to the fifth monarchy on earth if we compare it with another regicide tract:

Eikonoklastes.

Eikonoklastes, published almost at the same time as the second edition of *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, was the nascent Commonwealth’s rebuttal to the then popular *Eikon Basilike*, a widely circulated book portraying Charles I as a martyr. The newly appointed secretary was entrusted with the task of counterblast (Masson 4: 129-34). Two passages—one from Book Seventeen, the other from Book Twenty-eight—draw the critics’ attention.⁴¹ In Book Seventeen, entitled “Of the differences in point of Church Government,” Milton argued that the kings of this world had always hated and feared the true Christians: “Whether it be for that thir Doctrine seems much to favour two things to them so dreadfull, Liberty and Equality; or because they are the Children of that Kingdom which, as ancient Prophetes have foretold, shall in the end breake to peeces and dissolve all thir great power and Dominion” (154-55). True Christians are “the Children of that Kingdom,” which evidently refers to the fifth monarchy of Daniel 2. Furthermore, in Book Twenty-eight, Milton justified the regicide by quoting Psalm 149: “Therefore *To bind thir Kings in chains, and thir Nobles with links of Iron*, is an honour belonging to his Saints...and first to overcome those European Kings, which receive thir power; not from God, but from the beast; and are counted no better than his ten hornes...untill at last, *joyning thir Armies with the Beast*, whose power first rais’d them, they shall perish with him

⁴⁰ Barker 212-13; Christopher Hill, *Milton and the English Revolution* 282; Fixler 156; Lewalski, “Milton and the Millennium” 19; Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History* 63-64.

⁴¹ Arthur Barker and David Loewenstein consider the two passages to be millennial (Barker 203; Loewenstein, *Milton and the Drama of History* 64-65). Barbara Lewalski only discusses the second passage (“Milton and the Millennium” 19).

by the *King of Kings* against whom they have rebell'd; and *the Foules shall eat thir flesh*. This is thir doom writt'n, and the utmost that wee find concerning them in these latter days" (239). Milton compared the battle of the true Christians against the princes to the apocalyptic battle of the saints against the ten-horned beast. Therefore, "in these latter days," the infidel princes will be defeated by Christ, the King of kings, and the true Christians (the saints) will enjoy Christ's glory in the fifth monarchy. Apparently, Milton shared the millenarianism of the supporters of the Commonwealth.

Psalm 149 also appeared in *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio*, a Latin tract produced under the order of the Council of State to retaliate the harm done to the infant Commonwealth by the infamous royal tract *Defensio Regia pro Carolo* (Masson 4: 312).⁴² In Book Two, Milton reaffirmed the saints' privilege to judge wicked kings: "they shall bind in Chains the Kings of the Nations, (under which Appellation all Tyrants under the Gospel are included) 'and execute the Judgments written upon them that challenge to themselves an Exemption from all written Laws, *Psalm 149*" (38).⁴³ Furthermore, in Book Five, Milton reiterated one of his arguments in *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*—the sole kinship of Christ: "Whether you think that any other can deserve to be invested with a power here on earth, that shall resemble his power that Governs the World, than such a person as doth infinitely excel all other men, and both for Wisdom and Goodness in some measure resemble the Deity? and such a person in my opinion, none can be but the Son of God himself" (118).

Evidently, Milton refreshed his millenarianism in the regicide tracts and the First *Defence*. He associated Charles I with the Antichristian beast, justified the saints'

⁴² *Defensio Regia pro Carolo* (1649), written by Salmasius, is a vindication of the memory of the late king.

⁴³ I use Joseph Washington's 1692 translation, entitled *A Defence of the People of England*.

regicide, and waited for the coming of the fifth monarchy, in which there was no king other than Jesus. But Milton's millenarianism around 1650 was slightly different from that in the early 1640s. In the 1640s, Milton dismissed the idea of the fifth monarchy, associating it with Spanish imperialism, but in 1649 he accepted fifth monarchism and incorporated it with his millennial expectations.

C. The Fifth Monarchy Men

The fifth monarchy, nevertheless, did not come with the end of the English Civil War, when Cromwell defeated the Scottish army under Charles II at the Battle of Worcester on September 3, 1651. Shortly after the battle, some officers visited Cromwell to urge "the *General* and his *great Commanders*, to press forward in promoting that *glorious Cause*... and particularly, to quicken the Parliament to do some *honest and honourable works*" (Feake 39). After two meetings they realized that Cromwell was reluctant to persist in pursuing the millenarian ideal. At the end of 1651, they decided to turn against Cromwell and formed a gathered church at Allhallows "to pray for a new Representative, and to preach somewhat against the old" (Erbery 1). Thus began the Fifth Monarchist Movement.

At first, most of the leaders of the Fifth Monarchy Men (except Christopher Feake) still believed that Cromwell was the instrument of God. Meanwhile, the Rump Parliament was dissolved on April 20, 1653, and Cromwell was hailed as "*Moses... Deliverer, Judge and General*" (Spittlehouse, *Warning-Piece Discharged* 7). When the Commonwealth was about to form a new Parliament, Major-General Thomas Harrison (1606-60), an enthusiastic supporter of the Fifth Monarchy Men, proposed an assembly of seventy, "the number of which the Jewish Sanhedrim consisted" (Ludlow 358). With some modifications, Harrison's proposal was accepted by Cromwell, and the Nominated Parliament (also known as the Barebones Parliament or

the Parliament of Saints) met for the first time on July 4, 1653. In the first meeting, Cromwell addressed to members of Parliament, rejoicing the rule of the saints: “Truly God hath called you to this work” (18); “truly you are called by God, to rule with him” (19); “I confess I never looked to see such a day as this, it may be nor you, when Jesus Christ shall be owned as hee is this day” (22); “this way may bee the door to usher in things that God hath promised and prophesied of” (24); “we are at the threshold...and we have some of us thought it our duty to endeavour this way, not vainly looking on that Prophecy in *Daniel, And the Kingdom shall not be delivered to another people...* that you are at the edge of the Promises and Prophecies” (25). Cromwell seemed to share the millenarian dreams with the Fifth Monarchy Men.⁴⁴

However, the Fifth Monarchy Men’s millennial expectations were devastated by the abrupt dissolution of the Nominated Parliament and the elevation of Cromwell as the Lord Protector in December 1653. John Spittlehouse, a Fifth Monarchist who praised Cromwell as the English Moses a year ago, accused the Lord Protector of high treason (*Certaine Queries* 4). The Fifth Monarchy Men in London produced *A Declaration of Several of the Churches of Christ*, signed by 150 people from ten congregations, to counteract Cromwell’s protectorship. In the declaration, they claimed that Cromwell and his allies “comply with Antichrist” (7). They believed “that in this present Age the Lord JEHOVAH is setting up the fifth Kingdom” and “that (at this time) whenas the fourth Monarchy is partly broken in the Nations” (16). Thus, they were resolved “to encertain a *serious Consideration* and *Debate* for the benefit of all others, touching the premises, *viz.* of the *Laws, Subjects, Extent, Rise, Time, Place, Offices* and *Officers* of the *fifth Monarchy*, or Kingdom, whereby the *world* must be governed according to the Word of God, without the *mixture* (as now is)

⁴⁴ Although only 12 Fifth Monarchy Men can be identified out of the 140 members of Parliament, many of other members shared their millenarian belief (Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men* 68).

of *Mens Law and Inventions*, whether in respect of *Magistracy* or *Ministry, Church* or *Civil affairs*” (17). The Fifth Monarchy Men officially turned their back on Cromwell.

The First Protectorate Parliament was summoned in September 1654, and at the opening of the new parliament Cromwell formally reprimanded the Fifth Monarchy Men who thought that “they are the only men to rule kingdoms, govern nations, and give laws to people, and determine of property and liberty and everything else” (14).⁴⁵ The Fifth Monarchy Men were stigmatized as “ill made brains, and disturbed fancies, strongly tintured with an hypocondriack melancholy” (John Hall, *Confusion Confounded* 3). Cromwell could tolerate no threat to the stability of the new regime. Thus, Harrison was dismissed from the army, and a number of the Fifth Monarchy Men were imprisoned.⁴⁶ Nonetheless, other Fifth Monarchists remained active until the Restoration.⁴⁷

Although all of the Fifth Monarchists looked forward to the establishment of the fifth monarchy in England, they did not hold the same ideas of that monarchy in terms of when it came or how it was established. In fact, most of them did not attempt to spell out a detailed exposition of the doctrine of fifth monarchism. John Tillinghast (1604-55) was the only Fifth Monarchist that provided a thorough exegesis of relevant biblical texts.

Tillinghast was a pre-millennialist with a slight modification. He believed the corporeal resurrection of the martyrs, who would join the then living saints to reign

⁴⁵ For more discussions on the speech, see the next section.

⁴⁶ Some critics argue that millenarianism in England was shrinking by the time when the Fifth Monarchy Men emerged. Thus, their effort to revive the then already severely atrophied millenarian zeal was doomed to fail (Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men* 45; Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* 96; Toon, Conclusion 127-28; Wilson, “Comment on ‘Two Roads to the Puritan Millennium’” 340). However, I will demonstrate that English millenarianism, far from waning in the 1650s, hit a new high point in the mid-1650s.

⁴⁷ For the Fifth Monarchists’ activities after their clash with Cromwell, see Capp, *Fifth Monarchy Men* 99-130.

with Christ in the millennium (*Generation-Work, II* 155). In addition, he held that Christ would come “at the beginning of the thousand yeers, *Rev. 20.*” and that “the *General Judgement*” would follow the millennium (162-64). Moreover, he associated the millennium with the fifth monarchy. The seventh chapter of Daniel “doth contemporise with this Propheisie of the *Beasts* final ruine, and the *Saints* reigne a thousand yeers afterwards” (166). But he divided the fifth monarchy into two parts: the kingdom of the stone and the kingdom of the mountain (*Eight Last Sermons* 61).⁴⁸ The kingdom of the stone was the evening time of the fifth monarchy, while the kingdom of the mountain was the morning state of the fifth monarchy. The kingdom of the stone would be set up by the saints that “are by their Lord Employed to doe some notable service against his coming”; the kingdom of the mountain would be initiated by Christ’s Coming (62). In this sense, the kingdom of the mountain is the millennial kingdom, while the kingdom of the stone is the precursor of the millennium. Tillinghast’s distinction was based on his interpretation of the two numbers in Daniel 12.11-12: 1290 and 1335. “The first number 1290 dayes, points us to that time where *the kingdome of the Stone begins, as it is the Stone of Israel...*The second number, 1335 dayes, points at the time wherein *the kingdome of the Mountaine begins*” (63-64). In other words, the fifth monarchy was marked by two events: the conversion of the Jews and Christ’s Second Coming. His calculations of the dates of two events more or less followed John Archer’s. As indicated above, Archer predicated the conversion of the Jews to be 1650 or 1656 and the parousia to be 1700. Like Archer,

⁴⁸ Joseph Mede first proposed the two-fold state of the Kingdom of Christ. In his answer to Mr. Hayn’s second letter (22 July 1629), Mede argues that “*Nebuchadnezzar’s* Image points out *Two States* of the Kingdom of Christ...The *First* may be called, for distinction sake, *Regnum Lapidis*, the *Kingdom of the Stone*; which is the State of Christ’s Kingdom which hitherto hath been: The other, *Regnum Montis*, the *Kingdom of the Mountain* (that is, of the Stone grown into a Mountain, &c.) which is the State of his Kingdom hereafter shall be” (*Works* 909). In other words, the kingdom of the stone is the Church Militant, the kingdom of the mountain is the Church Triumphant—the millennial kingdom. Tillinghast agreed with Mede in the kingdom of the mountain, while he differed from Mede in interpreting the Kingdom of the Stone as the kingdom of the saints.

Tillinghast dated the abomination in 366, when Julian the Apostate became the Roman Emperor.⁴⁹ Therefore, the conversion of the Jews would take place in 1656 (366+ 1290) and Christ would arrive in 1701 (366+1335) (*Knowledge of the Times* 309).

Although not every Fifth Monarchist agreed to Tillinghast's chronology, all of them shared the belief in the immediacy of the fifth monarchy. But the differences of their opinions of the relationship between Christ's Coming and the fifth monarchy might cause great problems. Most of the Fifth Monarchy Men (such as John Tillinghast and John Rogers)⁵⁰ argued that the fifth monarchy would be established by the saints prior to the parousia, which justified their radicalism. Therefore, when John Simpson claimed that the fifth monarchy would not be established "until Christ comeinge personally" (Thurloe VI: 545), he was regarded a foe to the other Fifth Monarchy Men.

Not everyone with the belief in the imminence of the fifth monarchy was a Fifth Monarchist, however. As I have repeatedly argued in this dissertation, a person's millenarian ideas could not be defined by his political affiliation. For example, Thomas Goodwin, though a steadfast millenarian, openly repudiated the Fifth Monarchist Movement⁵¹ because the Congregational Independents ardently supported Cromwell's Protectorship.⁵² John Rogers, in his "Epistolary Perambulation" to John Canne's *The Time of the End* (1657), complained that the leading Independents betrayed their millenarianism: "some of your chiefest Heads were once of the same mind with us." Nonetheless, the differences between the Cromwellian millenarians

⁴⁹ See note 21 of this chapter.

⁵⁰ Rogers regarded 1666 as the beginning of the fifth monarchy (*Sagrir* 128-29) and expected Christ's coming in 1701 (*Ohel or Beth-Shemesh* 24).

⁵¹ On January 7, 1654, Goodwin, together with John Owen (1616-83), Philip Nye, and Sydrach Simpson, wrote a letter to the Congregational Churches of England and Wales, disavowing the Fifth Monarchist radicalism (Owen 66-68).

⁵² For the relationship between Cromwell's Protectorate and the Congregational Independents, see Sarah Cook 335-57.

and the Fifth Monarchy Men lied not so much in their religious beliefs as in their political positions.

D. Milton's Prose Works at the End of the Commonwealth

Milton went totally blind in 1652, but his blindness did not stop him from performing his secretarial duties. In the *Second Defence* (1654), Milton defended himself against those who ridiculed his blindness by asservating that “[a]t this moment I have the same courage, the same strength, though not the same eyes” (235). A great supporter of Cromwell, Milton served as his Latin secretary through the whole period of the Protectorate. In a sonnet written in May 1652,⁵³ Milton praised Cromwell as “our chief of men”; in the *Second Defence*, he devoted a long panegyric to the Lord Protector: “In this state of desolation, to which we were reduced, you, O Cromwell! alone remained to conduct the government, and to save the country” (288). However, Milton did not join Cromwell’s supporters in condemning the Fifth Monarchy Men. In fact, he did not mention any ideas of the fifth monarchy or the millennium until the publication of *The Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth* (March 1660).⁵⁴

The main argument of *The Readie and Easie Way* was the separation of state and church, a notion Milton had held for at least two decades.⁵⁵ Oliver Cromwell’s government united all evangelical denominations of Christians to form an established Church of England. All the clergy were paid by the state and thus were controlled by

⁵³ “To Oliver Cromwell” was first printed in *Letters of State* (1694), page xlv.

⁵⁴ Four prose works of Milton’s were published during 1652-1659: *Defensio Secunda* (May 1654), *Pro Se Defensio* (August 1655), *A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes* (February 1659), and *Considerations Touching the Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings out of the Church* (August 1659).

⁵⁵ Even though Milton was with the Presbyterians in the early 1640s, he advocated the ideal of Independency. For instance, Milton in *Of Reformation* regarded Constantine’s legalization of Christianity as the beginning of the the Antichrist’s reign (30).

the government.⁵⁶ Milton's sonnet to Cromwell revealed his aversion of the idea of an established church.⁵⁷ Eventually, Oliver's death on 3 September 1658 opened an opportunity for change.⁵⁸ Milton dedicated *A Treatise of Civil Power in Ecclesiastical Causes* (February 1659) to Richard Cromwell's Parliament and *Considerations Touching the Likeliest Means to Remove Hirelings out of the Church* (August 1659) to the restored Rump Parliament, criticizing the notion of a national church and petitioning for religious toleration. He promoted the true spirit of Independency, trying to seize an opportunity to shake off the "state-tyranie over the church" (*A Treatise of Civil Power* 31). He castigated those Independents who did not abide by Independency: "Independents should take that name, as they may justly from the true freedom of Christian doctrine and church-discipline subject to no superior judge but God only, and seek to be Dependents on the magistrate for thir maintenance; which two things, independence and state-hire in religion, can never consist long or certainly together" (*Considerations* 142-43).

In the first edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*, published in March 3, 1660, Milton reproved the Fifth Monarchy Men: "Ambitious leaders of armies would then have no hypocritical pretences so ready at hand to contest with Parlaments, yea to dissolve them and make way to thir own tyrannical designs: in summ, I verily suppose ther would be then no more pretending to a fifth monarchie of the saints: but much peace and tranquillitie would follow" (15). Interestingly, the passage was deleted in the second edition, published on the eve of the Restoration. Perhaps Milton deleted it because he came to realize that the total separation of state and church was impossible,

⁵⁶ For Oliver Cromwell's church policy, see Jeffrey Collins's "The Church Settlement of Oliver Cromwell."

⁵⁷ Milton called them "hireling wolves."

⁵⁸ It is generally held by scholars that Milton harbored his discontent with Cromwell after 1654. See David Armitage's "John Milton: Poet against Empire"; Martin Dzelzainis's "Milton and the Protectorate in 1658"; Austin Woolrych's "Milton and Cromwell: 'A Short but Scandalous Night of Interpretations'?" and Blair Worden's "John Milton and Oliver Cromwell."

as Don Wolfe and Arthur Barker suggest.⁵⁹ Or perhaps Milton removed the bitter comments because those “ambitious leaders of armies” (such as John Lambert)⁶⁰ were his last hope to deter the restoration of Charles II, as Barbara Lewalski and Michael Fixler argue.⁶¹ Or perhaps Milton jettisoned the harsh remarks because he shared allegiances with the Fifth Monarchy Men, as Stanley Stewart concludes (207-8). Whatever Milton’s reason was, two conclusions can be drawn from those critics. First, the passage should be understood within the political context of 1660. Second, Milton’s deletion must have owed itself to political considerations.

The second edition of *The Readie and Easie Way* was substantially different from the first. Scholars have been intrigued by the revision, and the publication of *The Censure of the Rota* (March 26, 1660), among other things, deserves our attention.⁶² The Rota Club was founded by James Harrington (1611-1677) in 1659. Harrington, an advocate of republicanism, devised an elaborate model of an ideal republic in *The Commonwealth of Oceana* (1656), dedicated to the Lord Protector. He divided an ideal Commonwealth into three orders: “An equal Common-wealth...is a Government established upon an equal Agrarian, arising into the superstructures or three orders, the Senate debating and proposing, the people resolving, and the Magistracy

⁵⁹ Wolfe proposes that Milton removed “passages or phrases applicable to religious liberty” because religious liberty was “now no longer possible” (295). Barker believes that the passage was deleted “because the practical political situation in 1660 seemed to demonstrate conclusively that the state must be so constituted as to provide for the defence of true spiritual religion, and that in consequence...the strict segregation of the spiritual and natural was not only undesirable but impossible” (279).

⁶⁰ Major-General John Lambert (1619-84) and his allies in the army, with the help of the Fifth Monarchists, expelled the Restored Rump Parliament in October 1659 and established an attempted military government (October to December 1659). Lambert was defeated by General George Monk (1608-70), and the Rump Parliament was restored the second time at the end of 1659. After that the Fifth Monarchy Men attempted for several times to gather forces to retaliate but failed one by one. At last, Lambert, supported by the remaining Fifth Monarchy Men, launched a final short-lived revolt in April 1660 (Capp, *The Fifth Monarchy Men* 126-30; Lewalski, “Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods” 193-97).

⁶¹ Lewalski states that the deletion was motivated simply by “Milton’s realization that Lambert’s uprising constituted the only remaining chance of preserving Puritan power” (“Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods” 200). Fixler claims that Milton excised the bitter words because he hoped “the possibility of a successful Army and Fifth Monarchist rising” would prevent the Restoration (207).

⁶² *The Censure of the Rota* was written by an anonymous royalist writer pretending to be James Harrington, the founder of the Rota Club (Lewalski, “Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods” 197; Stewart 205).

executing, by an equal Rotation through the suffrage of the people given by the Ballot" (23). Owing to this proposal of the rule of rotation by ballot, Harrington later called his ideal Commonwealth "the Rota."⁶³ During 1659 and 1660, Harrington and his followers—known as the Rota men—regularly met at Mile's Coffee House (the Turke's Head), discussing the model of the perfect commonwealth. John Aubrey (1626-97), a frequent visitor of the Rota Club, summarized the rule of rotation: "Now this modell upon rotation was that the third part of the House should rote out by ballot every yeare, so that every ninth yeare the House would be wholly altered. No magistrate to continue above 3 yeares, and all to be chosen by ballot, than which manner of choice nothing can be invented more fair and impartiall" (36).

There is no evidence that Milton ever visited the Rota Club, but he must have been familiar with its proceedings. Cyriack Skinner (1627-1700), a student of Milton's, was the chairman of the Rota Club (Aubrey 36).⁶⁴ The rule of the rotation of members of Parliament was discussed in the first edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*: "[T]he best expedient will be, and with least danger, that everie two or three years a hundred or some such member may go out by lot or suffrage of the rest, and the like number be chosen in thir places (which hath bin already thought on heer, and done in other Commonwealths:) but in my opinion better nothing mov'd, unless by death or just accusation" (9). Apparently, Milton preferred the perpetuity of members of the Parliament to the rotation by ballot.

The Censure of the Rota was a royalist satire specifically targeting the first edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*. The author criticized Milton's implicit rejection of rotation and his "design to perpetuate the present Members" (15): "[Y]ou had made good your title in a contrary sense; For you have really proposed the most ready and

⁶³ See Harrington's *The Rota: Or, A model of a Free-State, or Equall Commonwealth* (January 1660).

⁶⁴ Milton addressed two sonnets to Skinner: one first printed in the 1673 edition as Sonnet XVIII, the other first printed in *Letters of State* (1694), page xlvi.

easy way to establish downright slavery upon the Nation that can possibly be contrived” (16). In the second edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*, Milton revised his design, rendering it closer to the Rota Club’s: “[T]he known expedient is, and by som lately propounded, that annually (or if the space be longer, so much perhaps the better) the third part of Senators may go out according to the precedence of thir election, and the like number be chosen in thir places, to prevent the setting of too absolute a power, if it should be perpetual: and this they call *partial rotation*. But I could wish that this wheel or partial wheel in State, if it be possible, might be avoided” (48-49). The “wheel” evidently referred to the “Rota,” and the revision demonstrated Milton’s reluctance of accepting Harrington’s rule of rotation. Thus, it is reasonable to argue that Milton must have read *The Censure of the Rota* before he revised *The Readie and Easie Way*.

The royalist author of *The Censure of the Rota* also derided Milton’s betrayal of his faith in the fifth monarchy. The “Fift *Monarchy Men*,” said the author, “would have been admirable for [Milton’s] purpose if they had but dream’t of a fift Free-State” (12). However, I doubt that Milton deleted the passage concerning the fifth monarchy because he felt guilty over the denial of his belief. If Milton shared allegiances “with such zealots as the Fifth Monarchy Men” (Stewart 207-8), why did he disparage them in the first place?

If we compare that passage with Cromwell’s inaugural speech at the opening of Parliament under the Protectorate, we can see that Milton, like Cromwell, reproached the political activities of the Fifth Monarchy but honored the biblical prophecy of the fifth monarchy. On the one hand, Cromwell dismissed their idea as “the mistaken Notion of the fifth Monarchy. A thing pretending more spirituality, then anything else...such a pretence as this is...pretend for Justice and righteousness” (13-15), just as Milton reproved the “[a]mbitious leaders of armies” for having “hypocritical

pretences...pretending to a fifth monarchie of the saints.” On the other hand, Cromwell paid homage to the theological belief in the fifth monarchy: “A Notion I hope we all honour, wait, and hope for” (13). Therefore, I argue that although Milton shared the theological belief in the fifth monarchy with the Fifth Monarchists, he gave no consent to the political actions of those “ambitious leaders.” That was the reason why Milton belittled them in the first edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*. But the changed political situation forced him to recant his disparagement of them. Accordingly, the deletion of the passage cannot be interpreted as Milton’s changed position in regard to the theological belief in the fifth monarchy since the passage did not serve any purposes other than political ones in the first place.

Milton’s fifth monarchy was a theocracy. He repeatedly quoted the story of God’s displeasure over the Israelites’ plea for a king (1 Samuel 8) to justify his argument.⁶⁵ By comparing England to Israel, he advocated the superiority of theocracy.⁶⁶ As we have seen in the regicide tracts and the First *Defence*, Milton wished England to be the fifth monarchy, in which Christ’s sole kingship would be glorified. It is undeniable that Milton shared the Fifth Monarchist’s core faith—“No King but Jesus” (Canne, *A Seasonable Word to the Paliament-Men* 5). Don Wolfe claims that Milton “was in principle, if anything, a Fifth Monarchy man; that is, he believed in the temporal rule of Christ’s godly representatives here on earth” (287). In *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon*, written in April 1660, Milton, referring to the pre-kingdom Israel again, still maintained his ideal: “they might have livd happily

⁶⁵ See, for instance, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* 11; *Eikonoklastes* 223; *First Defence* 20- 21; *The Readie and Easie Way*, 1st ed., 3.

⁶⁶ Barbara Lewalski argues that “a strong millenarian impulse” led the seventeenth-century Englishmen to view themselves “as antitypes of the biblical Israel” (*Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric* 130). Sharon Achinstein also observes that the typological reading had a “millennial component”: “Israel was not just a model for England, as Rome or Greece might be, but England was a recapitulation of Israel” (17). For Milton’s habitual identification of England with ancient Israel, see John Hale’s “England as Israel in Milton’s Writings” and chapter three of John Hill’s *John Milton*.

under the Raing of God only, thir King” (6). The royalists, by contrast, argued that the ideal theocracy could not be realized in any state other than the kingdom of heaven. For example, Sir Roger L’Estrange (1616-1704), a staunch royalist pamphleteer, relentlessly ridiculed Milton’s millenarian dream: “*Under the Reign of God onely their King* you say. This expression, doubtfully implies you a Millenary. Doe you then, really expect to *see* Christ, Reigning upon Earth, even with *those very eyes* you *Lost?*” (8). Evidently, Milton’s belief in the realization of an earthly kingdom of God was well-known.

However, Milton did not identify the English Commonwealth with the fifth monarchy. In the second edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*, Milton hoped that the Commonwealth could continue “even to the coming of our true and rightfull and only to be expected King” (64). Milton’s separation of the Commonwealth and the fifth monarchy paralleled John Tillinghast’s division of the two phases of the fifth monarchy—the kingdom of the stone and the kingdom of the mountain—the first set up by the saints, the latter, Christ. Though not using words like “soon” or “shortly” to urge the imminence of God’s kingdom, Milton still believed that England could turn into the fifth monarchy one day, as he held in his regicide tracts a decade ago. If so, what held Milton’s tongue for about a decade?

Arthur Baker proposes that Milton suppressed his millenarian ideas for political reasons (382-83).⁶⁷ On the one hand, Milton looked forward to the arrival of the millennial kingdom; on the other hand, he believed Cromwell’s Protectorate was necessary for the preservation of the Commonwealth. Therefore, even though he did not consent to Cromwell’s church policy, he remained loyal to the Lord Protector. After Cromwell officially repudiated the Fifth Monarchy Men in 1654, any reference to the fifth monarchy would lend itself to being associated with civil disobedience.

⁶⁷ Elizabeth Tuttle held a similar argument (77).

Baker's argument sounds convincing especially when we consider Milton's bewildering shifts of political stances in the tracts of 1659 and 1660.⁶⁸ A passage in *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon* should suffice to illustrate how adaptable Milton could be. In order to prevent the Restoration of Charles II, the desperate Milton could even accept a temporary king: "chusing out of our own number one who hath best aided the people, and best merited against tyrannie, the space of a raigin or two we may chance to live happily anought, or tolerably" (10).⁶⁹ In a nutshell, Milton was willing to compromise his principles as long as the Commonwealth could persist.

Nonetheless, I am not convinced that the absence of references to the millennial kingdom was due to Milton's loyalty to Cromwell. I argue that the theological belief in the fifth monarchy did not necessitate political radicalism. Thomas Goodwin, for example, was a political ally of Cromwell as well as an advocate of the fifth monarchy. Moreover, Cromwell's consideration of the resettlement of the Jews in England indicated that the Lord Protector was not totally hostile to millenarian ideas.

We have seen that the idea of the conversion of the Jews was one of the central tenets of seventeenth-century English millenarianism.⁷⁰ Since the Jews were destined to play a key part in the millenarian scene, philo-semitism grew thereupon.⁷¹ Some divines argued that the Jewish readmission to England might facilitate their conversion, and the issue gradually became a subject of popular debate. "Whether," asked Roger Williams (c.a. 1604-83), a fervent advocate of the readmission of the

⁶⁸ For a detailed analysis of Milton's political positions in his tracts produced during the chaotic closing years of the Interregnum, see Lewalski's "Milton: Political Beliefs and Polemical Methods."

⁶⁹ Milton addressed *Brief Notes upon a Late Sermon* to General George Monk, a former loyal supporter of Oliver Cromwell who switched his support to Charles II during Lambert's uprising (see note 59 of this chapter). He praised Monk as "the General who hath so eminently born his part in the whole action" (2). Obviously, Milton was hinting that Monk could be a temporary king.

⁷⁰ For the development of the idea of the conversion of the Jews in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English millenarianism, see Christopher Hill's "Till the Conversion of the Jews" and Richard Popkin's "Hartlib, Dury and the Jews" and "Seventeenth-Century Millenarianism."

⁷¹ The Jews were banished from England by Edward I in 1290. For the rise of philo-semitism in England and the development of the idea of the readmission of the Jews to England, see David Katz's *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603-1655*.

Jews, “it be not the duty of the Magistrate to permit the Jews, whose conversion we look for, to live freely and peaceably amongst us?” (3). The call for the resettlement of the Jews in England culminated in 1655, when Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel (1604-1657) came to London to solicit for his people free access to England.⁷² While Menasseh remained in England, Cromwell ordered a committee to discuss the possibility of the return of the Jews.⁷³

Menasseh ben Israel was a Portuguese-Jewish rabbi and a fervent messianist. His famous *The Hope of Israel* (1650) was translated into English soon after its publication in Amsterdam and dedicated to the English Parliament. The masterpiece was inspired by the “discovery” of the ten lost tribes, a topic discussed extensively in the seventeenth century.⁷⁴ In 1644, Antonio Montezinos, a Portuguese Jewish explorer, claimed to have discovered in South America an Indian tribe descended from the lost tribes of Israel.⁷⁵ Menasseh believed that the Messiah would come as soon as the Jews were scattered to every country in the world. Thus, he claimed that “ALTHOUGH THE MESSIAH WERE LAME, HE MIGHT HAVE COME BY THIS TIME. Though we cannot exactly shew the time of our redemption, yet we judge it to be neer” (69). Messiah’s advent was at hand, and He would restore Israel and establish the fifth monarchy: “So after the *Ottoman* race began to flourish, we understand the prophecie of the two legs of the Image of *Nebuchadnezzar*, which is to be overthrown by the fifth Monarchy, which shall be in the world” (81). To accelerate

⁷² For a discussion of the controversy over the issue in mid-1650s, see Mordecai Wilensky’s “The Literary Controversy in 1656 concerning the Return of the Jews to England.”

⁷³ For a discussion of the event in a wider context, see Michael Fixler’s *Milton and the Kingdoms of God* 237- 49 and Peter Toon’s “The Question of Jewish Immigration”; for an analysis of the development of Menasseh’s midrash, see Ismar Schorsch’s “From Messianism to Realpolitik: Menasseh Ben Israel and the Readmission of the Jews to England.”

⁷⁴ The “ten lost tribes” refer to the captivity of the ten northern tribes of Israel in the late eighth century BCE. For a survey of the issue in the seventeenth-century England, see Albert Hyamson’s “The Lost Tribes, and the Influence of the Search for Them on the Return of the Jews to England.”

⁷⁵ For contemporary discussions of Montezinos’s discovery, see Menasseh’s *Hope of Israel* 4-15 and Thomas Thorowgood’s *Digitus Dei*.

the worldwide diaspora, Menasseh came to London in September 1655, when English millennial expectations reached to a high point.⁷⁶ Christer Bonde (1621-59), a Swedish diplomat in London, witnessed the popularity of English millenarianism at that time. In a letter to Charles X, the king of Sweden, on 23 August 1655, Bonde reported: “The common people, on the Exchange and in the streets, say openly that all the learned men have shown, from the prophecies of Daniel and by other reasons, that a king of Sweden, with England, shall overthrow the seat of the pope, and give to the service of God its right prosperity and use again; which time is now at hand, and the occasion necessary to be embraced” (Coyet and Bonde 124).

In *To His Highness the Lord Protector*, a petition presented by Menasseh to Cromwell during his stay in London in the fall of 1655, the rabbi ardently called for the abolition of all English laws against the Jews and the grant of their religious liberty in England. In the second part of the petition—“A Declaration to the Commonwealth of England”—Menasseh articulated his four motives of coming to England. The second motive is noteworthy: “My *second* Motive is, because the opinion of many Christians and mine doe concurre herein, that we both believe that the restoring time of our Nation into their Native Countrey, is very neer at hand; I believing more particularly, that this restauration cannot be, before these words of Daniel, Chap. 12. ver. 7. be first accomplished, when he saith, *And when the dispersion of the Holy people shall be compleated in all places, then shall all these things be compleated:* signifying therewith, that before all be fulfilled, the People of God must be first dispersed into all places and Countreyes of the World.” Menasseh argued that the Jews must be dispersed all over the world before the Messiah would come to Jerusalem to initiate the fifth monarchy. Though not sharing Menasseh’s Jewish

⁷⁶ John Archer and John Tillinghast, for example, postulated that the conversion of the Jews would take place in 1656, as mentioned earlier.

messianism, the English Christians welcomed his petition because they regarded the re-establishment of the Jews in England as the first step of the conversion of the Jews to Christianity.

A conference under Cromwell's order was met at Whitehall in December 1655.⁷⁷ Although the Whitehall Conference did not formally grant Menasseh's petition, Cromwell's interest in the idea of Jewish readmission demonstrated that he did not entirely repudiate the millenarian ideas. Moreover, the fact that many of the supporters of the project—such as Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye—were Cromwell's allies illustrated that Cromwell did not consider the expectations of the millennium as a political taboo. Therefore, it is questionable to argue that Milton repressed his millenarian ideas during Cromwell's Protectorate for political reasons.⁷⁸

Why, then, did Milton not express any millenarian ideas in the 1650s, if his belief in the future millennium was unwavering? Why did Milton not participate in the project of resettlement of the Jews in England, if he was so anxious to “see” the realization of the millennial kingdom?⁷⁹ Those questions cannot be satisfactorily answered until we come to examine Milton's millenarian ideas in the works of his last phase in chapter six.

Summary

We have seen, then, that Milton did demonstrate millenarian beliefs in his prose

⁷⁷ For historical accounts of the Whitehall Conference, see Nathaniel Crouch's “The Proceedings about the Jews in England in the Year 1655” and Henry Jessey's *A Narrative of the Late Proceeds at Whitehall*.

⁷⁸ It should be noted that the issue of the conversion of the Jews was not purely theological. Other concerns such as economical, political, and diplomatic came into play. I do not argue that all of the advocates of the project were millenarians. My point is that the theological discussions of millenarianism—such as the millenarian significance of the conversion of the Jews—were allowed in the Cromwellian government, and thus it is wrong to argue that Cromwell treated all of the millenarians as enemies.

⁷⁹ According to Michael Fixler, Milton was aware of the negotiations of the project of the readmission of the Jews from the beginning to the end (238).

works during 1640-60. However, his millenarian ideas did not stay the same but underwent some changes. In *Of Reformation*, Milton anticipated “the Eternall and shortly-expected King” to bring in the Judgment Day and to establish the “universal and milde *Monarchy*”; in *Animadversions*, Milton implored the “Prince of all the Kings of the earth” to usher in “the New Ierusalem, which...descends from Heaven.” Like Joseph Mede, Milton synchronized the Judgment Day and the millennium. However, Milton did not provide a specific chronology of the last days, nor did he elaborate on the nature of the first resurrection and the manner of Christ’s reign. We can argue that Milton’s millenarian position of 1641 was similar to Stephen Marshall’s: they both conceived history as a battle between Christ and Antichrist, and they both regarded England as God’s elected nation to fulfill the providence and to materialize an earthly millennial kingdom.

But Milton’s millenarian enthusiasm did not last long. In 1644, when he wrote *Areopagitica*, Milton no longer urged the immediacy of the millennium. Rather, he stressed the Christians’ duty in this post-lapsarian world—to seek the Truth incessantly. The transformation of Milton’s attitude toward the millennium also indicates that millenarianism did not distinguish the Independents from the Presbyterians in the 1640s and that one’s millenarian ideas were not determined by his/her political or religious affiliations.

Milton’s millenarianism revived around 1649, when Charles I was defeated, tried, and executed. But his millenarian ideas then were slightly different from the early 1640s. In *Of Reformation*, Spanish “dreame of a fift Monarchy” was Milton’s nightmare. In *Tetrachordon*, Milton feared the “fift Monarchy.” But from the regicide tracts and the First *Defence*, we can see Milton’s concurrence with his contemporaries in the widespread hope for the coming of the fifth monarchy. In *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, Milton “pray[ed] incessantly” to the “immortal King” that the “only

just & rightful kingdom” would come soon. In *Eikonoklastes*, Milton considered the true Christians to be “the Children of that Kingdom, which...shall in the end breake to peeces and dissolve all thir great power and Dominion”—the children of the fifth monarchy. The true Christians are also the saints of Psalms 149, who beat their kings that receive their power from Antichristian beast. In the First *Defence*, the saints of Psalms 149 acknowledge no other king “but the Son of God.”

But after 1651, millenarian ideas disappeared from Milton’s writings. His silence on millenarianism cannot be interpreted as his loyalty to Cromwell. Showing interests in the millenarian expectations did not turn him a defector, especially when we consider that the issue of the readmission of the Jews to England was seething in the mid-1650s. Milton, like other millenarians, looked forward to the conversion of the Jews. In “Observations on the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels” (1649), he claimed that “while we detest *Judaism*, we know our selves commanded by *St. Paul, Rom. 11.* to respect the *Jews*, and by all means to endeavor thir conversion” (60). Nevertheless, Milton did not participate in the discussion of that project. It was not until 1660 did Milton express his belief in an earthly millennial kingdom again. Though disparaging the political activism of the Fifth Monarchy Men in the first edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*, Milton shared the same millenarian expectations with them. In the second edition of *The Readie and Easie Way*, Milton envisioned a millenarian blueprint for England: the Commonwealth set up by the saints is the first part or the precursor of the millennial kingdom governed by the “true and rightfull and only to be expected King.” Though Milton did not explicitly articulate the timing of the coming of the millennial kingdom, his millenarian position was akin to John Tillinghast’s, one of the leading Fifth Monarchists. To conclude, there are two peaks of Milton’s millenarianism in his prose writing career—on the eve of the Civil War and after the victory over the royalists. He first

kindled his zeal for millenarianism in the early 1640s, but the ardor soon subsided. He rekindled his millenarian enthusiasm in 1649-51, but then he kept silent about it for another decade. Toward the end of the Commonwealth, Milton showed that he still believed in the realization of an earthly millennial kingdom. But this time he did not urge its imminence.

